



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,855	03/31/2004	Andrew D. Wilson	13768.810.72	5579
47973	7590	10/09/2007		
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT			EXAMINER	
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER			HADIZONOOZ, BANAFSHEH	
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE				
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/813,855	Applicant(s) WILSON, ANDREW D.	
	Examiner Banafsheh Hadizonooz	Art Unit 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/18/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

In response to the correspondence filed on 03/31/2004, claims 1-26 are pending. This office action is made **Non-Final**.

Claim Objections

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 5 is dependant upon claim 3 step (d), whereas claim 3 only has steps (a), (b) and (c). Claim 5 has been treated as being dependant on claim 4 step (d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,9,11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano et al. (US 2005/0226467) in view of Thieme et al. (US 2006/0056662).

Regarding claim 1, Hatano discloses a method for detecting a pattern object (e.g. biometric image) comprising detecting a physical property of the object (e.g. quality evaluation), computing sum of the set of template data values (see P.3, [0041]-[0042]), calculating a difference score between the stored data values and the input data values (e.g. quality evaluation) and determining whether the difference score is within a match threshold (See Fig.2, elements 203, 204). Hatano does not specifically disclose creating

template of the patterned object. However, Thieme discloses such in his invention (See abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Thieme's invention into the system and method of Thieme in order to design a system that maintains its database.

Regarding claim 2, Hatano further discloses calculating the integral sum of input data and determining whether the sum the sum is within a certain threshold (See P. 3, [0041] and P.4, [0046]-0047)).

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Hatano disclose calculating the difference score for the images as a step in template matching process (See P.6, [0083]-[0085]).

Hatano/Thieme does not expressly disclose the difference score is calculated as a sum of absolute difference and a sum of squared difference. However, this is considered to be a matter of design choice.

Regarding claim 11, Hatano discloses a memory (e.g. storage unit) to carry out the steps of claim 1 (See Fig. 1, element 4-1).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano et al. (US 2005/0226467) in view of Thieme et al. (US 2006/0056662) and further in view of Siegel et al. (US 2006/0034492).

Regarding claim 3, Hatano further discloses the template data value comprises pixel values (See P. 2, [0031]. Hatano/Thieme does not specifically disclose that physical property comprises light and that the pixel values indicate the intensity of light. However, Siegel discloses such in his invention (See P.2, [0033]). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of

Siegel's invention into the system and method of Hatano/Thieme in order to design a system that more effectively image matching process.

Claims 4-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatano et al. (US 2005/0226467) in view of Thieme et al. (US 2006/0056662) and further in view of Biswas et al. (US 7,120,280).

Regarding claim 4, Hatano/Thieme discloses creating plurality of templates. Hatano/thieme does not expressly disclose creating a binary mask. However, Biswas discloses creating a binary mask comprising transformed template data values, a mask bounding region having quadrilateral shape (See Fig.1), performing the steps of claim 2 (See Fig.5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Biswas into the limitations of Hatano/Thieme's invention in order to design a system with a more effective image processing features.

Regarding claim 5, Biswas discloses generating templates, determining a distance between the first center associated with the mask bonding and a second center (See Fig.3), and determining the redundancy threshold (See Col.3, 43-61 and Fig.5).

Regarding claim 6, Biswas further discloses computing an integral image array, selecting from array elements corresponding to four corners of the quadrilateral template and computing an integral sum as a function of four array (See Col.3, 43-61, Col.5, 4 - Col.6, 9).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Biswas further discloses a template matching process using a succession of surface coordinate locations (See Col.6, 26-44).

Regarding claim 10, Biswas discloses computing the statistical moment of the template data and the input and determining whether the data is within the threshold value (See Col.3, 43-61).

Claims 12-19 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siegel et al. (US 2006/0034492) in view of Biswas et al. (US 7,120, 280).

Regarding claims 12, 13, 22 and 26, Siegel discloses an interactive display (e.g. scanner), a light source, light sensor and a processing unit wherein the processing unit is in charge of detecting the intensity of light (See P.2, [0033], P.8, 0077)), and creating a template of the patterned object and acquiring the input data values (see Fig.8). Siegel does not specifically disclose computing sum of the set of template data and calculating the difference score to determine whether or not the score falls within a threshold. However, Biswas discloses such in his invention (See Col.3, 43-61, Fig.5, element 70). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of the Biswas invention into the limitations of the Siegel invention in order to design a system with a more effective template matching tool.

Regarding claim 14, biswas discloses that template data values comprise pixel values (See Fig.5, Col.4, 14-29).

Regarding claim 15, Biswas further discloses a mask bounding region that is used for quadrilateral template bounding (See Col.5, 4- Col.6, 25).

Regarding claim 16, Biswas discloses generating templates, determining a distance between the first center associated with the mask bonding and a second

center (See Fig.3), and determining the redundancy threshold (See Col.3, 43-61 and Fig.5).

Regarding claim 17, Biswas further discloses computing an integral image array, selecting from array elements corresponding to four corners of the quadrilateral template and computing an integral sum as a function of four array (See Col.3, 43-61, Col.5, 4 - Col.6, 9).

Regarding claim 18 and 19, Biswas further discloses computing an integral image array, selecting from array elements corresponding to four corners of the quadrilateral template and computing an integral sum as a function of four array (See Col.3, 43-61, Col.5, 4 - Col.6, 9), and a template matching process using a succession of surface coordinate locations (See Col.6, 26-44).

Regarding claim 21, Biswas discloses computing the statistical moment of the template data and the input and determining whether the data is within the threshold value (See Col.3, 43-61).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Siegel further discloses wherein the reflected light from the image comprises a range of intensities that can have two different values for use in determining the patterned object (See P.2, [0034]-[0036]) and wherein the range of intensities comprises a gray scale (See P.2, [0034]).

Regarding claim 25, Biswas discloses a plurality of template images each corresponding to a different orientation of the patterned object (See Figs, 6a-6c).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Banafsheh Hadizonooz whose telephone number is 571-272-1242. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272- 6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BH


ROBERT E. PEZZUTO
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER